

REMARKS

We acknowledge the examiner's indication that claims 14-16 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

We have amended the claims to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the invention. We have also added claims 21 and 22 which depend from claim 1. Upon entering these amendments, claims 1-17 and 20-22 will be pending in this application.

The examiner rejected claims 1, 3-12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Smith et al. (Disambiguating Geographic Names in a Historical Digital Library) and Wacholder et al. (Disambiguation of Proper Names in Text) or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Smith in vie of Wacholder.

The Examiner relies on Wacholder to show that the use of the Navigator to which Smith refers in his article involves geo-textual correlations that are derived for the corpus of documents rather than for any individual document within the corpus. To make the distinction between the claimed invention and Smith/Wacholder more clear, we have amended claim 1 to recite:

...selecting a toponym from the plurality of toponyms and for that selected toponym, selecting a reading of that toponym, and for that selected toponym-reading pair computing a value for a confidence that the selected toponym means that selected reading, wherein computing said value involves a summation over all documents in the corpus in which geo-textual correlations were identified that involved that toponym-reading pair.

This introduces the concept of a summation over certain documents within the corpus, something which is found in neither Smith nor Wacholder.

In our previous response, we made an argument about why Smith did not teach or suggest the invention of claim 10. In general, our argument pointed out that Smith did not disclose that "the selected (toponym, place) pair has a confidence value and that value is boosted by the presence of other toponyms." In rejecting our argument, the examiner responded by stating that it was his belief that we were relying on a distinction that was not recited in the claim. The examiner states that *the*

value of the confidence recited in clause (1) does not exist at the time *a pre-computed initial value* is obtained. To address this concern we have amended that clause as follows:

(1) obtaining a pre-computed ~~initial~~ number for a value ~~for the value of the~~ of a confidence that the toponym of the selected (toponym, place) pair refers to the place of the selected (toponym, place) pair, said pre-computed ~~initial-value~~ number derived from a statistical observation about a large corpus of documents;

With that change, we believe that our earlier arguments as to why Smith does not teach or suggest the invention of claim 10 still apply. More specifically, Smith does not disclose “boosting the value of the confidence for the selected (toponym, place) pair for the target document” “if a toponym is identified within the target document that has an associated place that is geographically related to the place referred to by the selected (toponym, place) pair,” as recited in claim 10.

For at least the reasons stated above, we believe that the claims are in condition for allowance and therefore ask the Examiner to allow them to issue.

Please apply any charges not covered, or any credits, to Deposit Account No. 08-0219, under Order No. 0113744.00124US2 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 24, 2009



Eric L. Prahl
Registration No.: 32,590
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP
60 State Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02109
(617) 526-6000 (telephone)
(617) 526-5000 (facsimile)